UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,103	08/31/2000	Sunay Tripathi	SUN1P707	5614

22434   7590   09/09/2004

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP   '
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER
GOLD, AVI M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/654,103	TRIPATHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Avi Gold	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 June 2004*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) *3,5,8,9,11,12 and 27* is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/26/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment received on June 28, 2004 has been entered and fully

considered.

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13, 15, 18-26, and 28-33 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,305.

Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a mobile-based client-server

system (see abstract).

Regarding claim 1, Gupta teaches in a web server, a method of sending a HTTP

request to a HTTP daemon, comprising:

receiving a HTTP request including HTTP request data;

associating a connection identifier with the HTTP request;

repeating the receiving and associating steps for one or more HTTP requests

(col. 2, lines 39-49, Gupta discloses a web agent that transmits and receives packed

HTTP messages to a web server; col. 5, lines 43-67, col. 6, lines 1-26, Gupta discloses

HTTP messages identified based on type, quantity, and/or size of the information to be

transmitted); and

sending the connection identifier and the associated HTTP request data for the

one or more HTTP requests in a first stream from a network cache accelerator of the

web server to a file system of the web server, the network cache accelerator being

adapted for communicating with one or more clients corresponding to the one or more

HTTP requests; and

storing the HTTP requests with the associated connection identifiers by the file

system, the file system being adapted for sending each of the HTTP request to the

HTTP daemon and receiving HTTP responses from the HTTP daemon for each of the

HTTP requests (col. 2, lines 59-62, Gupta discloses proxy and web agent layers that

have memory caches).

Regarding claim 2, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further

comprising:

creating the first stream;

wherein sending the connection identifier and the associated HTTP request data

for the one or more HTTP requests comprises sending the connection identifier and the

associated HTTP request data for the one or more HTTP requests in the first stream

(col. 2, lines 39-49; col. 4, lines 32-35, Gupta discloses a server message handler

transmitting packed HTTP messages downstream; col. 5, lines 4-5, Gupta discloses

packed messages transmitted upstream to the server).

Regarding claim 4, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 2, further

comprising:

creating a second stream from the file system of the web server to the network

cache accelerator of the web server;

obtaining HTTP response data associated with one of the HTTP requests by the

file system from the HTTP daemon; and

sending the HTTP response data and the connection identifier in the second

stream from the file system to the network cache accelerator (col. 2, lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 6, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 4, wherein

creating the second stream is performed in parallel with reading of an HTTP request

and preparation of a corresponding HTTP response by the HTTP daemon (col. 2, lines

39-58, Gupta discloses a web agent that transmits and receives packed HTTP

messages and how the respective client station proxy layer and server web agent

exchange HTTP messages between the web browser and web server).

Regarding claim 7, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 4, wherein

creating the second stream is further performed asynchronously with the reading of the

HTTP request and the preparation of the corresponding HTTP response by the HTTP

daemon (col. 2, lines 39-58).

Regarding claim 10, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further

comprising:

instantiating an object;

providing the connection identifier and the associated HTTP request data for the

one or more HTTP requests in the object; and

wherein sending the connection identifier and the associated HTTP request data

for the one or more HTTP requests comprises sending the object (col. 2, lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 13, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further

comprising:

receiving a read request at the file system from the HTTP daemon;

sending HTTP request data from the file system to the HTTP daemon in

response to the read request (col. 2, lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 15, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 13, further

comprising:

receiving HTTP response data associated with the HTTP request data at the file

system from the HTTP daemon (col. 2, lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 18, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 15, further comprising:

storing the HTTP response data such that the HTTP response data is associated with one of the HTTP requests and the associated connection identifier (col. 2, lines 65-67, Gupta discloses that information from the server can be duplicated for storage in the cache).

Regarding claim 19, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 15, further comprising:

sending a write command including the connection identifier and the HTTP response data to a data transport module capable of transmitting the HTTP response data to a client (col. 2, lines 39-58).

Regarding claim 20, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 15, further comprising:

creating a second stream from the file system to the network cache accelerator; and

sending the HTTP response data and the connection identifier in the second stream from the file system to the network cache accelerator (col. 2, lines 39-62).

Regarding claim 21, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 20, further comprising:

instantiating an object;

providing the HTTP response data and the connection identifier in the object; and

wherein sending the HTTP response data and the connection identifier

comprises sending the object to a data transport module of the network cache

accelerator for transmission to a client (col. 2, lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 22, Gupta teaches in a web server, a method of processing a

HTTP response including HTTP response data received from a HTTP daemon,

comprising:

receiving HTTP response data from the HTTP daemon;

obtaining a connection identifier associated with the HTTP response data (col. 2,

lines 39-58);

creating a stream from a file system of the web server to a network cache

accelerator of the web server, the network cache accelerator being adapted for

communicating with one or more clients corresponding to one or more HTTP requests,

the file system being adapted for sending each of the HTTP requests to the HTTP

daemon and receiving HTTP responses from the HTTP daemon for each of the HTTP

requests (col. 2, lines 59-62); and

sending the HTTP response data and the obtained associated connection

identifier in the stream from the file system of the web server to the network cache

accelerator of the web server for transmission to a client (col. 2, lines 39-62, col. 5, lines

56-64; HTTP response messages received from a web server).

Regarding claim 23, Gupta teaches a method of processing a HTTP request

including HTTP request data in a web server, comprising:

receiving HTTP request data and an associated connection identifier at a file

system of the web server;

obtaining HTTP response data associated with the HTTP request data at the file

system of the web server; and

sending the HTTP response data and the connection identifier by the file system

of the web server to a module of the web server for transmission to a client (col. 2, lines

39-58).

Regarding claim 24, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 23, further

comprising:

creating a data stream between the file system of the web server and the

module; and

sending the HTTP response data and the connection identifier in the data stream

from the file system of the web server to a data transport module of the web server (col.

4, lines 32-58; col. 5, lines 4-5).

Regarding claim 25, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 24, further

comprising:

receiving the HTTP response data at the file system from a HTTP daemon;

wherein creating a data stream and sending the HTTP response data and the

connection identifier in the data stream are performed by the file system for

transmission to the data transport module (col. 4, lines 32-35; col. 5, lines 4-5).

Regarding claim 26, Gupta teaches the method as recited in claim 24, further

comprising:

instantiating an object;

providing the HTTP response data and the connection identifier in the object; and

wherein sending the HTTP response data and the connection identifier

comprises sending the object to the data transport module for transmission to a client

(col. 2, lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 30, Gupta teaches a web server adapted for sending a HTTP

request to a HTTP daemon, comprising:

a processor (col. 3, lines 14-26, Gupta discloses a web server which inherently

would have a processor); and

a memory, at least one of the processor and the memory being adapted for (col.

2, lines 65-67, col. 3, lines 1-8, Gupta discloses memory cache):

receiving a HTTP request including HTTP request data;

associating a connection identifier with the HTTP request;

repeating the receiving and associating steps for one or more HTTP requests

(col. 2, lines 39-49, col. 5, lines 43-67, col. 6, lines 1-26);

sending the connection identifier and the associated HTTP request data for the

one or more HTTP requests in a first stream from a network cache accelerator of the

web server to a file system of the web server, the network cache accelerator being

adapted for communicating with one or more clients corresponding to the one or more

HTTP requests; and

storing the HTTP requests with the associated connection identifiers by the file

system, the file system being adapted for sending each of the HTTP requests to the

HTTP daemon and receiving HTTP responses from the HTTP daemon for each of the

HTTP requests (col. 2, lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 33, Gupta teaches a web server adapted for processing a HTTP

response including HTTP response data received from a HTTP daemon, comprising:

a processor (col. 2, lines 14-26); and

a memory, at least one of the processor and the memory being adapted for (col.

2, lines 65-67, col. 3, lines 1-8):

receiving HTTP response data from the HTTP daemon;

obtaining a connection identifier associated with the HTTP response data (col. 2,

lines 39-58);

creating a stream from a file system of the web server to a network cache

accelerator of the web server, the network cache accelerator being adapted for

communicating with one or more clients corresponding to one or more HTTP requests,

the file system being adapted for sending each of the HTTP requests to the HTTP

daemon and receiving HTTP responses from the HTTP daemon for each of the HTTP

requests (col. 2, lines 59-62); and

sending the HTTP response data and the obtained associated connection

identifier in the stream from the file system of the web server to the network cache

accelerator of the web server for transmission to a client (col. 2, lines 39-62, col. 5, lines

56-64).

Claims 28, 29, 31, and 32 do not teach or define any new limitations above

claims 1 and 22 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gupta in view of Kawabe et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,968,127.

Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a mobile-based client-server

system (see abstract).

As to claim 14,16, and 17, Gupta teaches the method of claim 1, 13, and 15.

Gupta fails to teach the limitation further including the use of a file descriptor and a private attachment.

However, Kawabe teaches an information processing apparatus (see abstract). Kawabe teaches the use of a file descriptor as a handle for accessing the, private attachment, resource corresponding to a name (col. 1, lines 23-27).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention to modify Gupta in view of Kawabe to use a file descriptor with a private attachment when sending and receiving HTTP data. One would be motivated to do so because it would result in an efficient method to send and receive data.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed on June 28, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The rejection of claims under 35 USC 102 stand;

Regarding claim 1, the sending of a connection identifier in a stream is disclosed by Gupta in col. 2, lines 39-49, col. 4, lines 32-35, and in addition col. 5, lines 43-67 and col. 6, lines 1-26 where HTTP messages are identified based on type, quantity and/or size of the information to be transmitted.

Regarding claim 2, the sending of HTTP response data is disclosed by Gupta in

col. 2, lines 39-58, in the abstract, and in addition col. 5, lines 56-64 where HTTP

response messages are received from a web server.

The rejection of claims under 35 USC 103 stand for the same reasons shown

above for 35 USC 102.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,162 to Pistriotto et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,389,462 to Cohen et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,951,694 to Choquier et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,418,544 to Nesbitt et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,131,122 to Sampson

U.S. Pat. No. 6,334,142 to Newton et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,377,984 to Najork et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,611,873 to Kanehara

U.S. Pat. No. 6,321,181 to Havens

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Avi Gold whose telephone number is 703-305-8762. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Avi Gold

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2157

AMG

SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER